DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 514 IR 012 718

AUTHOR McConeghy, Gary L.; McConeghy, Janet I.
TITLE A National Survey of Higher Education Media Services.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 54p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Audiovisual Centers; Budgets; *Delivery Systems; Educational Radio; *Educational Television; *Equipment Maintenance; Film Production; Higher Education; Learning Resources Centers; Organization Size (Groups); Photography; Questionnaires; School Surveys; Use Studies; Videotape Recordings
IDENTIFIERS *Video Production

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire was distributed to 486 two- and four-year colleges and universities with an enrollment of at least 1,000 students in order to determine the extent to which campus media service units were providing nonprint media services to their students and faculty. Administration, distribution services, maintenance services, video production services, and other production services were the major areas covered by the questionnaire. Analysis of the 220 responses received (a 45% response rate) indicated that: (1) the average total non-print media budget was $227,113, and the national average expenditure per student for media service was $38.71; (2) 60% of all schools did their own hardware repairs; (3) 75% of the respondents indicated that they produced video materials for campus users; (4) indicators of growth, such as increases in staff and maintenance or production activities, were evident in a majority of the schools; and (5) increasing use of media services was also reported. Seventeen tables are distributed throughout the paper. A list of the responding institutions and a copy of the questionnaire are appended, and four references are listed. (Author/MES)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED283514

A NATIONAL SURVEY OF HIGHER EDUCATION MEDIA SERVICES

by

Gary L. McConeghy, Ed.D.
Professor
Instructional Technology Faculty

and

Janet I. McConeghy, Ed.D.
Research Associate
Social Science Research Institute

Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 60115

IR012718

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gary L. McConeghy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

This study sought to determine the extent of non-print media services on college campuses. Over 480 schools were included in the sample.

Some findings include:

The average total media budget for all schools was $227,113. The **average expenditure per student** for media service was **$38.71.**

Sixty percent of the schools did their own repair of traditional media hardware.

About **75%** of the respondents indicated that they produced video materials for campus users, with a majority reporting that their production time had increased over the prior year.

Most productions were done on 3/4" video cassettes, but almost half are also using VHS format tapes for production and editing operations. Materials were distributed on VHS format more than half the time.

Indicators of growth, such as increases in staff and maintenance or production activities, are evident in a majority of the schools surveyed. Campus media services are being used more often this year than they were last year. Growth is seen as a result of supplying the user with meaningful service, and an increase in such service implies that media units are providing services to users who appreciate the effort and want to return for more.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

Background 1

Purpose of the Study 2

RESEARCH DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION 3

Research Design 3

Region and Size Samples 3

Type and Control Samples 5

Additional Sampling 5

Data Analysis 6

Questionnaire Development 6

Rate of Return 6

National Sample 6

Other Samples 6

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES 7

1985 Enrollment 7

Administrative Structure 7

Auxiliary Services 7

Broadcast Video 8

Broadcast Audio 8

Video Cable Systems 9

Regional Film Libraries 9

Library-Learning Centers 9

Administration 10

Budgets 10

Percent of Budget for Personnel 12

TABLE OF CONTENTS, Continued

Percent of Budget for Commodities 12

Percent of Budget for Equipment 12

Charge-Back of Costs 13

Size of Staff 14

Staff Additions or Reductions 14

Computer Access 15

Distribution Services 15

Campus Materials Libraries 15

Campus Equipment Distribution 16

Video Distribution Systems 17

Maintenance Services 18

Video Production Services 19

Number of Productions Completed 19

Production Hours During Year 19

Change from Prior Year 20

Type of Video Productions 20

Production for Campus Users 21

Video Studio Information 21

Studio Production Capabilities 22

Remote Production Capabilities 23

Video Editing Capabilities 23

Video Tape Distribution 24

Post-Production Capabilities 24

Other Production Services 25

Motion Picture Production 25

Photographic and Graphic Production 26

TABLE OF CONTENTS, Continued

SUMMARY 27

Administration 27

Distribution 28

Maintenance 28

Video Production 29

Other Production 29

General 30

REFERENCES 31

APPENDICES 33

Appendix A - List of Responding Institutions 33

Appendix B - List of States 40

Appendix C - Questionnaire 41

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Total Population by Size and Region 3

Table 2 - Regional Sample Selection and Response 4

Table 3 - Size Sample Selection and Response 4

Table 4 - Type Sample Selection and Response 5

Table 5 - Control Sample Selection and Response 5

Table 6 - Operation of Auxiliary Services 7

Table 7 - Average Reported Budget by Region 10

Table 8 - Average Repored Budget by Size 11

Table 9 - Average Reported Budget by Type 11

Table 10 - Average Reported Budget by Control 11

Table 11 - Charge Back of Service Costs 13

Table 12 - Video Production Activity for Campus Divisions 21

Table 13 - Special Production Equipment Available 22

Table 14 - Special Production Areas Available 22

Table 15 - Editing System Used 23

Table 16 - Distribution Format Used 24

Table 17 - Post-Production Capability 25

A NATIONAL SURVEY OF HIGHER EDUCATION MEDIA SERVICES

by

Gary L. and Janet I. McConeghy

INTRODUCTION

Background

A recent report of a survey of 111 national media leaders indicated that use of a variety of new technologies could be expected to increase during the next five years and that such use would substantially affect our lives by the end of the decade. ("Media Leaders," 1986) Increased use of cable television systems, video cassette recorders and personal computers was predicted by those persons responding to the "1985 Media Leaders Survey" conducted by United Media, a Scripps Howard company.

Although this is just one example of the many discussions of the impact of technology on the way we live and learn, few studies have been found which discuss the educational use of technology and its impact on students who are presently in the system and who will be users of technology in the future. Two major questions must be asked. First, are schools using technology extensively in instructional situations, and second, are today's students learning to use such devices wisely and competently?

A partial answer to the first question might be found in Instructional Technology in Higher Education, a study released by the Center for Education Statistics, reported on a 1986 survey of 2,830 institutions. Among other items, the report notes that computer, video, and audio technology was available for instructional use by faculty and students in more than 90% of colleges and universities. The study also noted that student participation was higher in video telecourses than in audio courses and that, although most institutions offered faculty training in the instructional use of computers, more public than private institutions offered such training.

Print and non-print media operations have been in existence for many years, especially in many public two- and four-year colleges, but the extent of use by faculty for actual instructional support has not been fully determined. The authors of this report have, therefore, established a four-phase investigation of the impact of technological advances on teaching and learning. The study discussed in this report is the third phase of the overall project.

The researchers became interested in the overall research area following an analysis of teaching method and student achievement in high school students. (J. McConeghy, 1985) Over 123,000 17-year-old high school students were included in a secondary analysis of the National Assessment of Educational Progress studies of 1975-1982. The purpose of that analysis was to determine the relationship of teaching method to student achievement. Although the study included traditional methods, specific questions relating to media center assignments, use of computer-assisted instruction, and watching television lectures were also included.

The types of learning experiences reported by the respondents were shown to have had a significant and positive relationship to achievement rank. Students who were exposed to a variety of teaching methods, including assignments involving other than print-oriented materials, could be expected to do better in school.

If students in high school were reporting greater use of non-traditional methods and were doing better as a result; and if the newer technologies such as personal computers and use of on-line databases, for example, would become more available to these students after high school, could the nation's colleges be expected to expand use of non-print technology and would this technology be easily available to post-secondary teachers?

The second stage of the project was an analysis of the use of television in community colleges and universities in Illinois. (G. McConeghy, 1985) Although the original purpose of that study was to provide information to be used by Northern Illinois University in decisions concerning the operation of television services on its campus, the study also served to provide information concerning the extent of the use of a specific medium in a post-secondary environment. Indications were that post-secondary institutions were providing service, at least in television, to both faculty and students and that such usage was increasing, especially by academic departments.

The researchers decided to expand the original television survey to a broader media survey of a wider range of institutions. The third phase of the overall project, the expanded survey, resulted in the study reported in this document - a national survey of selected colleges and universities.

The overall project will continue with a national survey of post-secondary faculty and students. This study will attempt to determine the relationships between faculty awareness of services available to them, their actual utilization of such services, and the opinions of students as to the extent and value of such assignments in their courses.

Purpose of the Study

This study sought to determine the extent to which campus media service units were providing a variety of non-print media services to their campuses, especially to student and faculty users. Although campus media services could be, and often are, provided by learning resource centers, especially on community college campuses, the acquisition and distribution of the print material operation of those centers was not a focus of this study.

A secondary purpose was to collect and disseminate information regarding the state of campus media operations to interested observers. Budget, staff and technical information could be of use to administrators and students who are interested in the development of media operations.

This study provides, therefore, a description of the state of media usage in a large number of institutions during the Spring of 1986. Generalizations and extrapolations must be developed with some caution, knowing that the typical media operation, especially involving some of the more sophisticated media forms, is subject to rapid change in both support and utilization.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION

Research Design

The national survey on general media utilization was distributed to a proportional sample of **25%** of a total of 1,948 post-secondary schools having a head count enrollment of more than 1,000 students as reported in the 1983 Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS). It was assumed that an enrollment of at least 1,000 students was necessary for a school to have a viable media service. A total of **486** schools were included in the sample.

Representative schools were selected on the basis of (a) region of the country (REGION), (b) head count enrollment (SIZE), (c) whether they were public or private (CONTROL), and (d) whether they were two or four year schools (TYPE).

As a practical explanation of procedure, a database containing the total list of schools with enrollments over 1,000 students was sorted by region, by size, by control, and by type. This procedure generated a sorted listing which is included in **Appendix A**. The program then selected every fourth institution and copied all of the HEGIS demographic information pertaining to each selected institution to a personal computer. The personal computer was used to print address labels from the information supplied and was also used to input data as responses were returned.

Region and Size Samples

The HEGIS data base provided several regional listings, each based on an economic or educational division. Since the Office of Business Economics (OBE) listing provided at least eight regional divisions, this ranking was used to select regional samples. Schools were also selected by reported enrollment (SIZE), with HEGIS size codes beginning at **code 4**, 1,000-2,499, and continuing through **code 8**, 20,000+. A listing of the number of schools in each size group and region is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Total Population by Size and Region

Region Name	1,000-2,499	2,500-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-19,999	Over 20,000	Total
New Eng.	62	41	30	10	4	147
Mid East	142	96	77	47	11	373
Grt Lakes	140	73	54	38	25	330
Plaines	90	31	28	14	6	169
So East	226	94	66	38	18	442
So West	74	44	32	21	12	183
Rky Mts	24	13	14	7	3	61
Far West	47	43	68	53	32	243
	805	435	369	228	111	1,948

Information regarding the total number of schools in each region, the number of schools selected in the sample for that region, the number of responses for the region, and the percentage of responses returned from the sample is presented in Table 2. A list of states in each region is presented in Appendix B.

Table 2

Regional Sample Selection and Response

Region Name	Total Population	Sample Size	Response (n)	Response (%)
New Eng.	147	36	13	36 %
Mid East	373	93	41	44
Grt Lakes	330	83	42	51
Plaines	169	42	19	47
So East	442	110	52	47
So West	183	46	17	37
Rky Mts	61	15	9	60
Far West	243	61	27	44
	1,948	486	220	45 %

Similar information on size of school is presented in Table 3. Slight differences in sample size compared to total population can be explained by noting that every fourth school was selected from the total list of 1,948 schools. Some regions may have had a one or two school deviation from an exact 25% sample.

Table 3

Size Sample Selection and Response

HEGIS Size Cat.	Total Population	Sample Size	Response (n)	% of Response
1,000 - 2,499	805	201	88	44 %
2,500 - 4,999	435	108	50	46
5,000 - 9,999	369	93	46	49
10,000 - 19,999	228	57	24	42
20,000 +	111	27	12	44
	1,948	486	220	45 %

Type and Control Samples

In addition to region and size, HEGIS information includes a description of the **type of school** (two- or four-year structure), and **method of support** (either public or private). Since it was desirable to analyze some of the data using both of these categories, a breakdown by type and by control was included.

Population, sample and response information for the population divided into two- or four-year schools (TYPE) is presented in Table 4. Although HEGIS TYPE information contains several divisions, all schools were placed into either a two- or four-year category for purposes of this study.

Table 4

Type Sample Selection and Response

HEGIS Type Cat.	Total Population	Sample Size	Response (n)	% of Response
Four Year	1,160	272	117	43
Two Year	825	214	103	48
	1,948	486	220	45 %

Table 5 contains similar information for the population divided according to the way the school is administered or supported. Note that the total population contains almost twice as many public schools as private.

Table 5

Control Sample Selection and Response

HEGIS Control Cat.	Total Population	Sample Size	Response (n)	% of Response
Public	1,296	323	151	47
Private	652	163	69	42
	1,948	486	220	45 %

Additional Sampling

In addition, since the previous television survey was limited in scope, and in an effort to compare certain responses in 1986 to those given in 1983, questionnaires were sent to all of the Illinois colleges and universities, both public and private. The 1983 television survey included all public two- and four-year schools, but did not include all private schools.

Finally, in order to survey a broad-based single category of large schools, questionnaires were sent to all non-sample schools reported to have a head count enrollment of over 20,000 students. These large schools could be assumed to have more expansive media operations than others and could also be assumed to provide media services which are not part of library or learning center facilities. Whether these assumptions were true and whether such separation, where found, had an impact on budget, was part of

The 98 Illinois and 114 Large School questionnaires brought the total sample size to 637.

Data Analysis

Several programs from the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) were used for data analysis, including a determination of frequency of response, an analysis of budget and percentage means, and a log-linear analysis of relationships of several factors. Several tables were also generated using the SPSS-X package.

Questionnaire Development

A 60-item questionnaire was developed to elicit information regarding the amounts of money being spent to provide non-print services, the staff and facilities required, an evaluation of the types of production being done on each campus and the type of services provided to various campus units, including individual faculty members. Although the questionnaire was based upon the original television questionnaire, questions were added which included other forms of media utilization. A copy of the questionnaire is included as Appendix C. A total of 650 questionnaires was printed. Mailings, including stamped return envelopes, were completed by the end of March, 1986.

Rate of Return

National Sample

A total of 220 responses were obtained, representing a return rate of 45% of the sample. The survey was done by mail, with no follow-up. As indicated in Table 2, the highest percentage of regional returns came from the Rocky Mountain region, although the returns from the Great Lakes region might be more significant in terms of the number of institutions involved.

Almost 50% of the institutions within the 5,000 - 9,999 size range returned questionnaires, although returns from all size ranges were well within the 40% response range. Two-year schools responded better than did four-year schools, and public schools tended to respond better than did private schools.

Other Samples

A total of 46 Illinois schools returned their questionnaires, which is a rate of return of 47%. Although this is slightly above the national average of 45% return, it is much lower than the response rate of 66% for the original Illinois television survey.

A total of 46 large institutions responded, for a return rate of 40%, lower than the national average.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

1985 Enrollment

Institutions were asked to list their Fall, 1985, headcount enrollment. In most cases, institutions were within the same range that they reported in 1983, although several reported increases which would have put them into the next higher bracket and two reported losses which would have put them in the next lower bracket. The average headcount enrollment reported was 5,867 students. Actual reported enrollments ranged from 900 to 32,400 students.

Administrative Structure

Respondents indicated that the person to whom the Media Director reported was most often the Director of the Library. This structure was found over 21% of the time. An average of 16.4% of the Media Directors report to the Vice President of Academic Affairs; while an average of 7.7% of the Media Directors report to an Academic Dean.

Over fifty percent of the Media Directors report to some academic officer, which indicates an administrative structure normally established to serve the instructional aspects of the school. Only five percent of the respondents indicated a different type of structure. This structure has an impact on the services offered and the funds allocated for such services, as discussed in further sections of this report.

Auxiliary Services

Thirty-six institutions (16%) reported that the media center operated a broadcast video service, twenty-nine institutions (13%) reported that the media center operated a broadcast radio service, seventy-two (32%) reported the operation of a campus television cable service, seventy-one (32%) reported the operation of a regional film library, and 170 (77%) reported that a library or learning center was part of the media center operation. Additional information concerning these items is contained in Table 6. It should be noted that although many institutions reported that the media center did not operate any one or all of these auxiliary services, such services may be available to the campus through operation by another agency.

Table 6

Operation of Auxiliary Services

Type of Service	Offering		Not Offering		Not Responding	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Brdcst Video	36	16.4	175	79.5	9	4.1
Brdcst Radio	29	13.2	182	82.7	9	4.1
Cable System	72	32.7	139	63.2	9	4.1
Film Library	71	32.3	140	63.6	9	4.1
Library/LRC	170	77.3	41	18.6	9	4.1

Each of these services has an impact on the total budget of the media service operation, especially in terms of man-power and equipment. Broadcast operations, either video or radio, normally do not directly serve the instructional programs of the school, but are more often public relations arms of the institution. It was important, therefore, to analyze operating budgets for schools with or without such services. The authors also assumed that those schools which include one or more of the auxiliary services may support more comprehensive media operations. One assumption which was not supported was that larger schools would tend to provide auxiliary services more often than small schools. As indicated below, this was not the case, especially in broadcast video or audio services.

Broadcast Video

Thirty-six institutions reported that their campus media service included broadcast video operations. This combination was most often found: (a) in the Southwest region, with over 25% of those schools responding positively; (b) in schools with enrollments under 5,000 students (27% each in size category one and two, Table 3); (c) almost equally in two- or four-year schools; and (d) most often in public institutions (over 86%). The average budget for schools providing such service was $531,859, and the average budget for schools not providing such service was $173,531.

Broadcast Audio

Fewer schools (28) reported inclusion of broadcast radio operations within the central media service. This was somewhat surprising in that the authors had expected that institutions would provide more radio services than television services. The highest reported operation of radio stations was found in the Mideast region. More schools in the enrollment range between 1,000 and 2,499 students supported radio stations, and, in this case, more four-year schools (72%) had such a service than did two-year schools. Almost twice as many public schools reported the inclusion of radio than did private schools. The average budget for schools providing radio broadcast operations was $549,029. The average for schools not providing such service was $184,577.

The obvious conclusion is that schools which support either television or radio services spend more money than those which do not provide such services. Stated in a different way, those schools which provide a wide range of media services, including comprehensive learning center services, photographic or graphic art support, and comprehensive video or film production, could have sufficient funds available which allow them to support broadcast radio or television facilities. Conversely, those schools which provide a minimum of media service to the campus may not be able to afford to support either one of these expensive operations. Certainly, the difference in expenditures cannot be entirely explained by the costs of the unit in question. Schools which have either television or radio stations may simply have more money to spend because the central administration supports their activities.

It is interesting to note that both television and radio broadcast operations are not confined to large schools. No data are offered to support a conclusion, but the authors suspect that larger schools may provide radio or television broadcast facilities which are not included in the campus media services.

Video Cable System

This question was included in an effort to determine the extent of the use of television on campuses which may not have broadcast facilities. Institutions could, perhaps, afford to cablecast programs to students even if they could not afford to support a broadcast facility. Analysis reveals that twice as many schools have a campus video system than have a broadcast video facility. The predominant region was the Southeast, with almost 25% of the institutions providing such services being located in that region. Public, four-year schools with enrollments between 2,500 and 9,999 students reported highest involvement. Costs were high, with an average budget of $368,789, but this figure is considerably below the average for schools reporting the provision of television or radio services.

Regional Film Library

Almost one-third of the responding schools indicated that they operated a regional film library in conjunction with their campus media services. Regional film libraries were most common in the Far West region, with over 55% of schools in that region reporting that a film library was supported. Large schools, those with enrollments over 20,000, reported operation of a film library most often, with 75% of schools in that range responding positively to the question. Responses were almost evenly divided between two-year and four-year schools, but an overwhelming 78% of the libraries are operated by public institutions. The average budget for a media service which also operates a regional film library was $245,759.

Library/Learning Centers

Since the majority of responses to this survey were from two-year schools, it should not be surprising that most (77%) schools indicated that a library/learning resource center operation was included as a part of the campus media service. The use of the "Learning Center", or a combined library/media operation, is much more common at two-year institutions. Over 84% of the two-year institutions reported that learning centers were included in campus media operations.

It should be noted, however, that many four-year schools also reported this type of administrative structure. In fact, just over 70% of the four-year schools responding to the survey indicated that a learning center was included in the media operation.

Inclusion of learning centers was most common in the Southwest and the Great Lakes regions. This structure was least common in the New England and Rocky Mountain regions. More schools with enrollments under 2,500 students responded positively to this question, but analysis indicates that a majority of responses in every size category were positive. Public schools supported combined media service/learning center operations more often than did private schools. The average total budget for those schools which combine operations was $245,759.

Administration

This section included a budget or funding analysis, staffing information and a breakdown of the percentage of service devoted to various campus users. Also included was a section on computer utilization for administrative operations.

Budget

The average total non-print media operating budget for all schools was $227,113, with responses ranging from $1,520 to over $10,000,000. Ninety-two schools (42%) did not respond to the question, with reasons for such non-response including indications that it was not possible to determine the total budget for non-print operations or that such information was not released by the institution.

Although budget figures were not expressed as a percentage of the total budget of the school, it was possible to compute an average expenditure per student by institutions in each region, size and administrative structure. The national average per-student expenditure for non-print media service was $38.71. Tables 7 through 10 provide comparisons by HEGIS category.

As can be seen, average costs per student were almost three times higher in the Far West region than they were in the South East. Schools with similar enrollments can determine if their expenditures are significantly different than the averages listed above. Note, however, that many of the schools with large enrollments were found in the West and Great Lakes regions. This may explain why costs were higher in those areas.

A typical public, four-year institution, with an enrollment of 20,000 or more students and located in the Far West had the most money to spend on non-print media; while a typical private, two-year school, with an enrollment of 1,000 to 2,499 students and located in the South East had the least to spend.

Table 7

Average Reported Budget by Region
Ranked by Average Cost Per Student

HEGIS Region Name	Average Fall FY85 Enrollment	Average Total Budget	Average Cost per Student
Far West	9,975	$ 580,624	$ 58.20
Plaines	4,155	241,517	58.12
Great Lakes	5,215	288,474	55.31
National Average	5,867	227,113	38.71
South West	5,639	205,910	36.51
New England	3,827	118,159	30.88
Rocky Mountains	4,558	120,158	26.36
Mid East	5,818	135,957	23.37
South East	5,737	113,291	19.74

Table 8

Average Reported Budget by Size
Ranked by Average Cost Per Student

HEGIS Size Category	Average Fall FY85 Enrollment	Average Total Budget	Average Cost per Student
20,000 +	25,218	1,344,834	53.33
5,000 - 9,999	7,201	290,067	40.28
National Average	5,867	227,113	38.71
2,500 - 4,999	3,660	123,696	34.07
10,000 - 19,999	13,407	439,438	32.78
1,000 - 2,499	1,729	42,073	24.33

Table 9

Average Reported Budget by Type
Ranked by Average Cost Per Student

HEGIS Type Category	Average Fall FY85 Enrollment	Average Total Budget	Average Cost per Student
Four Year	6,167	263,463	42.72
National Average	5,867	227,113	38.71
Two Year	5,526	185,823	33.63

Table 10

Average Reported Budget by Control
Ranked by Average Cost Per Student

HEGIS Control Category	Average Fall FY85 Enrollment	Average Total Budget	Average Cost per Student
National Average	5,867	227,113	38.71
Public School	7,404	263,463	30.67
Private School	2,504	185,823	28.45

Surprisingly, schools with enrollments ranging from 10,000 to 19,999 had smaller budgets than did schools with enrollments ranging from 2,500 to 9,999 students. It should be noted, however, that many schools in the South East region had average enrollments in the 10,000 to 19,999 range and that that region also had the highest response rate, with almost 24% of the responses coming from the South East region.

Percentage for personnel

An average of 44.13% of the total budget was devoted to personnel in those institutions which responded to the question. A figure of 60% of the total budget was reported most often (mode) by respondents.

In some instances, schools reported that personnel funds were not allocated from the budget for non-print operations and that personnel were paid from funds allocated for the library or learning center. In other instances, respondents indicated that personnel served a variety of functions within the total operation and that the figure given on their response was an estimate of funds devoted to non-print operations. Finally, several schools indicated that it was not possible to determine the percentage of the budget which was devoted to personnel.

Percentage for commodities

An average of 16.18% of the total budget was devoted to the purchase of non-print expendable supplies or commodities. This would include such items as video tape, audio tape, film, office supplies or any other items used in non-print media operations. The most often reported percentage (mode) for the purchase of commodities was 10%.

Percentage for equipment

The average percentage devoted to equipment purchases was 13.55% for all schools reporting. Almost 15% of the respondents indicated that their institution spent about 10% of their total non-print budget on equipment purchases.

Interestingly, those schools which reported the integration of broadcast video services within the central media operation reported just slightly higher percentages of expenditures for equipment, with an average of 15.27%.

Schools with broadcast radio or cable systems reported lower percentages of expenditures for equipment. Schools having radio services spent about 13.10% of their budget on equipment, while those not having radio services spent about 14.28% for equipment. Schools with campus cable systems spent about 13.37% for equipment, while those without such services spent about 14.51% for equipment.

The overall percentage of 13.55% for equipment purchase seemed consistant with the above averages, whether the operation included more expensive services or not.

Many respondents indicated that their budget system did not allow for the purchase of equipment from operating funds, but that such purchases were made as capital outlay. Although this may be a matter of language, many states allow capital purchases of equipment only in conjunction with construction or remodeling projects. If this is, in fact, the case with those schools reporting the need to rely on capital requests for upgrading existing equipment, such purchases may be too long delayed. If, however,

capital improvement or capital outlay requests are simply another means of allocating equipment funds from operating funds, it seems somewhat cumbersome to be forced to use this convention.

In any case, provision for replacement of outmoded equipment, especially in media operations, must be an ongoing expense and should be budgeted for on a regular basis, if possible.

Charge-Back

Schools were asked to identify areas in which charges were made to departments or faculty for services rendered. The responses are summarized in Table 11.

Table 11

Charge Back of Service Costs

Department or Area Charged	All Costs Charged	Some Cost Charged	No Charge for Services
Academic Production	9.5 %	32.3 %	47.3 %
Administrative Production	12.7	30.9	46.8
Athletic Production	46.8	15.0	29.1
Public Relations Production	16.8	30.0	42.3
Academic Maintenance	6.4	20.0	62.3
Administrative Maintenance	7.3	20.9	61.4
Athletic Maintenance	11.4	19.1	56.4

These figures are consistent with a pattern of allocating funds for academic support to academic service agencies (see Administrative Structure section on page 7). In many cases, athletics and public affairs operations are funded from non-allocated funds and are expected to pay for services obtained, especially in production of materials. This relationship is less clear when dealing with central administrative services. As indicated in the responses listed in Table 11, however, many schools do charge for services which are not specifically instructional in nature. Over 40% of all schools charge some amount for production of materials.

Maintenance is another service for which some charges are made, although quite a bit less than for production. Some schools may charge only for parts used; while others consider this function part of their base service, if they provide it at all.

Size of Staff

Respondents were asked to indicate the size of their non-print media staff. For schools which responded to the question:

Administrative staff: **60%** had one administrator, overall average was **1.5** persons.

Distribution staff: **51%** had no distribution staff, **21%** had at least one person in this position, overall average was **1.3** persons.

Maintenance staff: **51%** had no maintenance staff, **31%** had at least one person in this position, overall average was **.9** persons.

Production staff: **49%** had no production staff, **21%** had at least one person in this position, overall average was **1.6** persons.

Clerical staff: **40%** had no clerical staff, **37%** had at least one person in this position, overall average was **1.0** persons.

Student Help: **21%** had no student help, **10%** had at least two in this position, overall average was **9.3** students.

The range for most of these items was quite large. Administrative staff listings ranged, for example, from 1 to 35 persons. Although it is possible that a very large operation would employ 35 administrators or supervisors, the average of 1.5 indicates that most operations are small and are managed by very few people. It is also interesting to note that most media centers had at least one administrator, even if no other positions were available. Also note the extensive use of student helpers. Well-trained, part-time student workers can often perform many tasks in a media operation, and work especially well in distribution, production and clerical positions. Nine institutions listed more than 50 student workers.

Staff Additions or Reductions

The researchers asked the respondents to indicate how many staff members had been added or eliminated during the past year. Almost **19%** of the respondents indicated that they had added at least one person during the past year. The number of positions added ranged from 0 to 4, with an overall average of .35 positions added to the operation.

In contrast, only **10%** of the total group indicated that they had lost a position during the year. The number of positions eliminated also ranged from 0 to 4, with an average of .14 positions eliminated from the operation.

These responses seem to reveal a status quo operation. Not many are being hired, but, at the same time, not many staff members are losing positions. It is important to note that wholesale reductions are not taking place anywhere, at least among our sample, and that slightly more positions are being added than are being eliminated.

Computer Access

The next section involved the use of computers within the operation of the media center. The researchers were interested in the degree of computer utilization, in the type of equipment available, and in specific uses for the computers indicated.

Over **87%** of the respondents indicated that they had access to a computer for some type of media service operation. Of these, **12%** had access to a main frame computer, 37% had access to a micro-computer, and **40%** had access to both a main-frame and a micro-computer in some combination. The micro-computer brand most often listed was an **IBM** (30%), with an **Apple IIe** listed about 20% of the time.

Over **36%** of the respondents indicated that they used the computer to write scripts, over **56%** used the computer to prepare budgets, about **24%** used the computer to track personnel records, over **51%** used the computer to prepare catalogs, **41%** used the computer to track circulation, over **58%** used the computer to keep track of inventory, **23%** used the computer to track repair parts, and over **55%** used the computer for correspondence.

The most extensive use of computers, at least in the typical media center operation, was for the more traditional cataloging and distribution functions; preparation of catalogs, keeping track of budgets and inventory, and generating correspondence.

Distribution

Several questions were included in this section in an effort to determine the extent and type of delivery system included within the operation. The major emphasis was on service to faculty members, either personally or in their classrooms.

Campus Materials Libraries

Over **64%** of the respondents indicated that they maintained a film library for campus use. Earlier we found that about 32% of the schools maintained a regional film library. In this case, almost twice as many institutions have purchased and are maintaining a campus library for faculty users. Film libraries are expensive to initiate and to properly maintain, and expanding such service to off-campus users requires greater expenditures due to loss or damage and to the increased level of record keeping. Many schools may, therefore, wish to restrict use of films to the campus.

The number of films available in campus libraries ranged from **10 to 9,500**, with an overall average of about **364** prints available for use. This represents a sizable investment in both films and maintenance equipment.

The delivery of campus films to faculty offices or classrooms was a service which was provided by **45%** of the institutions responding to the survey. About **48%** of the respondents indicated that they did not provide such service. Again, provision of a film delivery service requires an expense which small schools may not wish to support. Indeed, a breakdown of the data indicates that larger schools tend to support office delivery and smaller schools do not.

Respondents also indicated that they provided other non-print materials libraries for campus use:

Over **70%** indicated that they provided a film-strip library.

Over **77%** indicated that they provided an audio tape library.

Over **58%** indicated that they provided a phono disk library.

Over **84%** indicated that they provided a video tape library.

Over **71%** indicated that they provided a slide library.

Over **52%** indicated that they provided a transparency library.

Although these are more traditional instructional materials, respondents have indicated that campus users are still interested in having access to the variety listed here. Video tape libraries are fairly new to many operations, but their popularity is obviously quite high. Whether video tapes will ever totally replace film use is not known, but it is interesting to note that more institutions provide video tape libraries than they do film libraries. Perhaps this area should be the subject of another survey.

Transparency materials are most often stored in the offices of the user, or near classrooms, and such materials tend to be very course specific. This may account for the lower percentage of respondents indicating that they maintain transparency libraries.

Campus Equipment Distribution

Respondents were asked several questions pertaining to the use of media equipment on campus.

Over **88%** of the respondents indicated that their operation included an equipment pool for faculty use. Only 7% indicated that they did not have such a pool.

Over **76%** indicated that their service would deliver such equipment to classrooms upon faculty request.

Almost **71%** indicated that some equipment is permanently housed near classrooms for faculty use.

Only **30%** of the respondents indicated that they would rent equipment to off campus users.

These responses were consistent with the general philosophy of providing service to academic users by academic service agencies. In those institutions in which funds are available, providing equipment pools and delivering equipment to the classrooms tends to satisfy the user and, although the provision of such service does require effort and expense, the operation may be somewhat compensated by the higher degree of user satisfaction and reduced maintenance on equipment.

Video Distribution System

The final section under Distribution included questions pertaining to a campus video distribution system. Researchers wanted to ascertain the extent of such systems, if in existence, and to determine the type of system which had been installed.

Only **12%** of the respondents indicated that they maintained a video cable system providing signals to residence halls or dormitories. Of course, few, if any, two-year schools would have residence halls and would not, therefore, answer this question in the affirmative.

Over **40%** of the respondents indicated that they had a video cable system to their academic classrooms.

The total number of rooms served by the cable system ranged from 1 to over 4,000, with the number of 100 rooms most often listed. The overall average number of rooms served by a cable system was **99.8** rooms, which is very close to the mode.

Respondents indicated that an average of **18.5%** of the total number of rooms contained color monitors, however, at least 12% of the respondents indicated that all of the rooms fed by the system contained color monitors.

Over **28%** of the respondents indicated that their campus had facilities for video satellite reception.

Only **3.6%** of the respondents indicated that their campus had facilities for video satellite transmission.

Several items in this section contained results which were not anticipated by the researchers. The researchers assumed that the extent of cable system installations to classrooms was much higher than shown in the data. Television cable operation has been in existence for many years, and the use of cable transmission can result in a very high quality signal at the receiving end, especially if color is used. That the number of campuses not using cable for transmission is as high as it is was surprising. The fact that small, highly portable, video recorders are now available may be the reason for the lack of use of this method of materials distribution.

Another area of interest was the number of rooms served by those who were using cable systems for distribution. An average of almost 100 rooms per institution reveals a large commitment in equipment and time on the part of these institutions. It is interesting to note that the second figure most often listed on responses was 20 rooms. This is quite a significant difference in investment in both equipment and installation.

A third area of interest was the increase in the number of color monitors in rooms served by cable systems. Again, purchase and installation of color equipment, especially in a large number of rooms which may have previously been served by black and white equipment, represents a considerable expense to the responding institution. The questionnaire did not differentiate between classrooms and residence hall rooms on this question, but it should be noted that residence hall rooms usually contain receivers supplied by the student and, therefore, may not be included in the percentage of rooms actually having color monitors installed.

Maintenance

This section was included in an effort to determine the extent to which institutions provide for maintenance or repair of equipment in on-campus or off-campus repair centers.

The largest group, **59.5%**, of respondents provide for in-house maintenance services. Of those who do not provide for in-house repair of equipment, a total of **39.5%** of the respondents use an outside contractor for most of their equipment maintenance and **8.2%** indicated that they make use of another campus office to provide for regular equipment maintenance. The remainder of responses do not provide for maintenance of any equipment.

Almost **33%** of the respondents indicated that they maintained studio video cameras in house.

Over **37%** of the respondents indicated that they maintained field video cameras in house.

Over **47%** of the respondents indicated that they maintained video tape recorders.

Over **33%** of the respondents maintained video editing systems.

Over **46%** of the respondents maintained video receivers or monitors.

Over **52%** of the respondents maintain classroom film projectors.

About **23%** of the respondents maintain 35mm camera equipment.

About **55.5%** of the respondents indicated that they maintain general media equipment, including slide projectors, filmstrip projectors, etc.

Almost **46%** of the respondents indicated that they provide for the regular maintenance of campus audio equipment.

The average size of a repair shop was listed at **240 square feet**, which equates to an area about 15 by 16 feet. With one bench position occupying about 12 by 12 feet, or 144 square feet in area, the average repair shop has just about enough room for one repair person and some parts storage. Seven percent of the respondents indicated that their repair shop was about 100 square feet in area.

An average of 1.3 maintenance bench positions were listed in the responses. This average is slightly greater than the average of .9 maintenance staff position listed in the personnel section.

The average cost of parts inventory on hand was **$6,207.61**. This figure ranged from $75 to over $300,000, with a mode of about $100. It should be noted that a total of **54%** of the respondents indicated that they had <u>no</u> parts inventory of any kind.

Some of these responses could have come from the group which indicated that they contracted out maintenance or had some other office on campus do it. Almost **50%** of the respondents indicated that others performed maintenance for them and would not, of course, have maintained a parts inventory. Others may simply buy parts as they are needed.

A total of **55%** of the respondents indicated that, when compared to the prior year, the number of hours devoted to maintenance had increased. About **35%** stated that their maintenance had stayed at the same level, and **21%** indicated that the hours devoted to maintenance had decreased.

Responses to these questions were close to expectations. Those items most often repaired on campus were the traditional media devices, included classroom film projectors and other items of general purpose media equipment. A significant number of institutions were involved in maintenance of video equipment, and a surprising number were found to be repairing devices such as 35mm cameras, which are often sent to specialized repair shops.

The fact that about one-third of the schools maintain their own video equipment is also important, especially in view of the trend toward more compact and complicated digital video devices. This equipment is highly sophisticated and requires skilled video technicians both for operation and repair. Some of the larger schools, with much larger investments in video operations, may be able to afford this level of maintenance.

Video Production

This section included questions pertaining to the level of video production done on the campus. In some instances, other departments than the central media center actually produced video materials and the central media center respondent was encouraged to send the questionnaire to that office for completion of this section. About **25%** of the respondents either did not do video production or did not choose to answer the questions in this section.

Number of Productions

The actual number of video productions completed during the past fiscal year ranged from **1 to 600.** The number listed most often was **10.** The average number of productions completed during the year was **32.2%.** A video production was defined as a series of production steps leading to a specific end package. Of course, not all video productions are complicated and many may not require extensive studio or remote production or sophisticated post production. In any case, a unit engaged in 600 video productions during any one average, 260 working day year, would be extremely busy, since the average production load for that unit would be 2.3 completed video productions per day.

Production Hours

Respondents indicated that the total number of hours devoted to video production during the past fiscal year ranged from **2 to 7500,** with the number of hours most often listed being **200,** and the average being **382.6** hours. Some respondents may have been confused by the question and may have included man-hours, instead of actual hours of production. Again, it is difficult to visualize a production center working more than 2,080 hours in one year.

Change from Prior Year

A total of 111 institutions, or **62%** of those responding, indicated that their video production hours had **increased** when compared to the prior year. Twenty-two institutions, or **12%**, reported a **decrease** in video production; and 46 institutions, or **26%**, reported that their video production hours had **stayed the same** from one year to another.

All size groups reported increases in video production hours, with the exception of the group with enrollments between 2,500 and 4,999 students. The average for this group stayed the same from one year to another.

Type of Video Production

Several questions were asked regarding the percentage of time devoted to various types of video productions. Institutions were asked to identify the percentage of time devoted to either scripted projects or simple event recordings, the percentage of time devoted to either studio or remote productions, and the percentage of time devoted to either production or post-production activities. The responses are summarized below.

The most often reported percentage of **scripted versus event** recorded projects was **10%** scripted, **90%** event recording for all respondents. The average was **23.9%** scripted, **53.9%** event recording for all respondents. In other words, the primary production activity for most reporting institutions was the recording of events which required very little advanced preparation on the part of the production teams. The remainder did not answer the question.

The most often reported percentage of **studio versus remote** productions was **50%** studio, **50%** remote productions. The average for all institutions was **28.5%** studio, **46.7%** remote productions. When non-respondents were removed, the average for all institutions responding to the question was **46.24%** studio, **63.52%** remote productions. When respondents were analyzed by type of school, four-year schools averaged **44.09%** studio productions and two-year schools averaged **48.65%** studio productions.

The most often reported percentage of **production versus post-production** activity was again a **50%** response in both categories. The average for all institutions, including non-respondents was **45%** production, **28%** post production. The averages for those who responded to the question were **61.20%** production activity, **41.68%** post-production activity.

These figures support previous studies which indicated that the trend in video production is away from complicated, scripted studio productions, and now tends to include the recording of campus events which do not involve a great deal of advanced planning or scripting. Respondents have indicated that much of their activity involves remote productions, which, in turn, requires heavier post production or editing activity.

Video Production for Campus Users

The respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of video production time devoted to specific campus users. The results are summarized in Table 12 by type of institution.

Table 12

Video Production Activity for Campus Divisions

Campus Division	Four-Year School	Two-Year School	Total Responses
Academic Affairs	25.25 %	18.94 %	22.30 %
Individual Faculty	19.44	25.44	22.25
Business Affairs	1.52	.84	1.20
Administration	4.69	4.89	4.78
Student Affairs	7.96	5.45	6.79
Athletics	4.00	5.74	4.81
Public Relations	8.02	9.60	8.76
Not Responding	29.12	29.10	29.11

Video production was predominantly done for academic departments or for individual faculty members. Two year schools devote slightly more time to athletic and public relations productions. Surprisingly, a large number of respondents did not answer several of these questions and in some cases, the total percentage of a school did not total 100. It can only be suggested that production centers may not keep very good records of clients by division or that the particular campus does not have divisions as indicated in the table.

Keeping accurate records of the type of production done, and for whom, can sometimes be of benefit, especially if budgets can be split among various cost centers.

Video Studio Information

Several questions were included concerning the number and type of video cameras available to the central media operation. The number mentioned most often by schools was **three** studio cameras. The average was **1.99**. The top five predominate brands, ranked in order of response, were **Sony**, **JVC**, **Panasonic**, **Hitachi** and **Ikegami**. No question was included as to specific model or cost of the studio cameras used.

Studios sizes ranged from **25** square feet to **20,000** square feet, with an average reported size of **735** square feet. Twenty-five square feet seems to be a meaningless figure, since it represents an area about five feet square, and it may be wise to use the figure of 100 square feet, which represents the second lowest on the range of studio size responses. Even this figure, which would be about ten feet square, would indicate a very small studio area. At the high end, two respondents listed studios of 18,000 and 20,000 s.f. These may, in fact, be several studios, since the question did not ask about the actual number of studios available. At any rate, an average of about 735 s.f. would seem to be an acceptable size

Respondents were asked if their studio was used for classroom instruction during the academic year. **Forty-eight** percent of the respondents replied in the affirmative to this question. Although the researchers did not ask what kinds of classes were taught, several respondents listed courses in television production as being most prominent among the courses taught in a studio.

The average number of hours devoted to classroom instruction in studios was about **6** hours per week. Responses ranged from one hour to 95 hours per week. It is difficult to imagine how any production can be done if the studio is being used a total of 95 hours per week.

Respondents were asked if they provided engineering support for classes which were taught in the studio. **Thirty** percent of the respondents said that they did provide such support.

The average number of hours devoted to such engineering support during the past year was **99.3** hours. Responses ranged from 3 to 4,000 hours of engineering support for the past year. With an average of 2,080 hours during a normal work year, a total of 4,000 hours represents the output of slightly less than two full time engineers.

Studio Production Capabilities

Respondents were asked a series of questions pertaining to the special capabilities available when engaged in studio productions. The reponses are listed in Table 13.

Table 13

Special Production Equipment Available

Special Equipment	Four-Year School	Two-Year School	Total Responses
Special Effects	56.4 %	47.6 %	52.3 %
Chroma Key	39.3	30.1	35.0
Generate Titles	50.4	46.6	48.6
Film Chain	35.9	35.9	35.9

Table 14

Special Production Areas Available

Special Areas	Four-Year School	Two-Year School	Total Responses
Separate Control Rm	55.6 %	43.7 %	50.0 %
Separate Film Chain	29.1	21.4	25.5
Separate Master Cont	25.6	15.5	20.8

Both types of institutions were about equally well equipped with special video production equipment. In all cases except a film chain, two-year schools seemed to have slightly less equipment than did four-year schools. In many cases, four-year schools, including many major universities, developed video production facilities earlier than did two-year schools, especially community colleges. This earlier development may have allowed many of the four-year schools to add to existing equipment rather than be forced to purchase all new equipment for a new facility. Even though a slight difference in specialized equipment holdings appears between types, it should be noted that the average two-year school reported more studio production activity than did four-year schools. The conclusion could be that two-year schools were doing more with less sophisticated equipment.

Remote Production Capabilities

Respondents were asked to identify the quantity and type of remote video equipment available to them. **Fifty** percent of the respondents listed two remote cameras available. All respondents averaged **2.6** remote cameras available for video production. The five most predominate brands included **Panasonic** (33%), **Sony** (18%), and **JVC** (13%). Other b

Only **4.5%** of the respondents indicated that they were able to use a remote van with control equipment for video production. Use of a remote van with video control equipment often allows multiple camera remote production. On the contrary, **76.8%** of the respondents indicated that remote video production was done with one camera (film style). Again, this production style requires considerable editing or post-production activity.

Video Editing Capability

Respondents were asked to indicate editing formats. Responses are listed by type in Table 15.

Table 15

Editing System Used

Editing System	Four-Year School	Two-Year School	Total Responses
3/4" Cassette	59.8 %	56.3 %	58.2 %
1/2" Beta Format	10.3	11.7	10.9
1/2" VHS Format	48.7	39.8	44.5
1" Format	7.7	1.9	5.0
2" Format	1.7	1.9	1.8
Computer-Aided	21.4	17.5	19.5

A similar question was asked in a survey of 75 institutions in 1983. Responses to the present survey indicated that 3/4" cassettes were still the predominate format for video editing, although the VHS format has increased almost 10 percentage points from one survey to another. In the 1983 survey, use of 3/4" cassettes was the choice of over 93% of the respondents, but the present survey shows a drop of almost 30 percentage points.

Clearly, the half inch format, especially the VHS format, is making inroads on the editing scene and may even overtake the 3/4" format within the next few years.

Both types of institutions were making use of computerized video editing, with four-year schools slightly ahead in this area. A computer controlled editing system may use any of the tape formats, but more commonly used computer controlled formats are 3/4" and 1". The one inch format was much more available to the four-year institutions.

Video Tape Distribution

Although production departments may record and edit on a particular format, it is also important to determine which format is used for actual distribution of video tapes to users. Respondents were asked to indicate the type of tape format used for distributing finished video materials. Responses are summarized in Table 16.

Table 16

Distribution Format Used

Editing System	Four-Year School	Two-Year School	Total Responses
3/4" Cassette	29.9 %	43.7 %	36.4 %
1/2" Beta Format	5.1	4.9	5.0
1/2" VHS Format	61.5	54.4	58.2
Video Disk	3.4	4.9	4.1

These figures reveal a dramatic difference between production and distribution of video tapes. Although respondents indicated that much of their production and editing was done on 3/4" cassettes, responses to the question pertaining to distribution reveals that most distribution was done on VHS tape. Well over half of both types of institutions were using this format for distribution. Obviously, these responses also indicate a heavy involvement in tape duplication, from the production or editing format to the final distribution format.

Finally, although the numbers are quite small, it is surprising to note that some institutions are distributing materials on video disk. Centers may be purchasing disks for distribution, or they may be creating masters for video disk copies. If the latter is the case, the investment in production of completed materials is much higher. If, however, the material is in suitable final form, a disk format may be usefull, especially in interactive video programs.

Post-Production Capabilities

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the type of special purpose equipment available to them in post-production operations. Responses, again listed by type of institution, are summarized in Table 17.

Table 17

Post-Production Capability

Special Purpose Equipment	Four-Year School	Two-Year School	Total Responses
Special Effects	41.0 %	31.1 %	36.4 %
Chroma-Key Inserts	35.9	21.4	29.1
Generated Titles	58.1	50.5	54.5

Use of these special purpose devices within the editing operation involves more than a simple video editor and playback device. Introduction of special effects and chroma-key inserts requires equipment usually coupled to the editing system by switchers. Highly sophisticated editing can be performed with this type of equipment. Title generators can be installed as simple titling devices, but can also be coupled with other post production equipment in sophisticated operations. As indicated in Table 17, this type of equipment was more available to four-year institutions. As indicated in Table 15, these institutions are also more involved with computer-controlled editing systems.

Responses in the video production section imply growth and a high degree of sophistication in video production. Institutions have both normal and special purpose equipment, and are even exploring some of the more advanced devices such as video disk and computer-assisted editing.

Other Production Services

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they were involved in other type of production activities. Responses are presented in this section of the report.

Motion Picture Production

Only twelve instititutions, or 5.5% of the total sample, reported any involvement in motion picture production. This figure could easily be compared to the relatively high percentage of 68% of the institutions which were involved in some form of video tape production. The figure becomes even more significant when compared to the average of 88% of institutions whose video production either increased or stayed the same compared to the prior year.

Institutions listed the percentage of time devoted to motion picture production by campus divisions. Results are listed below, ranked from highest percentage of service to lowest. Percentages are listed for those who responded to the question. **Figures in parentheses indicate the percentage of video production provided to the same unit.**

Respondents provided motion picture service to Public Relations divisions an average of **53%** (16.8%) of the time available during the past year (FY1985) of operation.

Production for Student Affairs averaged **46%** (14.6%) of time available.

Production for Academic Affairs or individual faculty averaged **24%** (76.9%) of time available.

Production for Athletics averaged **20%** (58.8%) of time available.

Production for General Administration averaged **15%** (13.1%) of time available.

Production for Business divisions averaged **5%** (7.4%) of time available.

It may be no coincidence that the two highest users of motion picture services are related to promoting the institution to the general public. Film has great impact, is easy to handle and distribute, and generally makes use of equipment commonly available to most people. Video tape, on the other hand, may require copies in a variety of formats in order to be distributed as widely.

Photographic and Graphic Production

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent of involvement in 35mm and graphic productions operations. Results are indicated below.

Sixty-four percent of the institutions indicated that they provide some type of 35mm production service for campus users. **Sixty-two** percent of the respondents indicated that they provide graphic or transparency production services for campus users.

Academic users, either departments or individual faculty members, account for **38%** of the 35mm or transparency production operations during the year. Other large users included Public Relations (**10%**) operations, General Administration (**5%**) and Student Services (**5%**).

Sixty-five percent of the institutions provide a facility for faculty to use for production of 35mm materials or overhead transparencies.

SUMMARY

This survey sought to determine the extent to which campus media service units were providing a variety of non-print media services to their campuses, especially to student and faculty users.

The survey instrument was distributed to a proportional sample of 25% of a total of 1,948 post-secondary schools having a head count enrollment of more than 1,000 students.

A total of **220**, or **45%**, of the institutions responded to the survey. A breakdown of the sample by various demographic measures reveals that responses were all representative of the population, regardless of category.

Administration

The predominate administrative structure was one of academic support by an academic unit. **Sixty-four percent** of the respondents reported to an academic officer at the Dean's level or above. The Director of the Library was mentioned most often as the person to whom the media director reported and over **77%** of the respondents indicated that a library or learning resources center was combined with the media services operation. As could be expected, separate media center operations were increasingly more common as school size increased. Inclusion of learning centers was most common in the Southwest and Great Lakes regions, and least common in New England and the Rocky Mountain regions.

Less than one third of those responding listed operation of broadcast video, broadcast audio, or film libraries as being included in their service to the campus. If these services were available, they were provided by another campus unit. In general, if the media services unit did provide for these auxiliary services, operating budgets were considerably higher; as much as five times higher in most cases. More institutions operate broadcast video services than operate broadcast audio services.

The average total budget for all schools was **$227,113**, with responses ranging from $1,520 to over $10,000,000. Many schools did not respond to this question, either from lack of knowledge about the budget, or from unwillingness to reveal such information. Most respondents indicated on the questionnaire if they had difficulty in supplying budget information, and we can only assume that other non-respondents simply did not know what their budget was.

It should be noted that responses to this survey were most often quite complete and questions were answered with care. It would be very easy to ignore a questionnaire of this type, especially since it did not come from some government agency, but many people did respond and were careful with their responses. The overall assumption, therefore, concerning the budget sections of many respondents is that many media center personnel do not know how much is being spent for non-print media services on campus.

We should also note that, although such figures are probably accurate, the low and high ends of the budget range reveal very little in terms of actual dollar costs of providing non-print media services. Certainly, a figure of $1,520 (the lowest figure reported as total budget) cannot include personnel costs or much in the way of expenses for equipment purchase. At the other extreme, a total budget of over $10,000,000 must include something other than non-print costs, probably costs for an integrated library operation. With the average budget for a typical, separate, full service, non-print media services operation about $1,250,000, even an average of $227,113 seems low.

An analysis of the **average expenditure per student** revealed a range from a low of $19.74 per student to a high of $58.20 per student, depending upon the category used for ranking, with the most noticeable differences evident in the regional rankings. Generally, institutions in the Great Lakes, Plaines, and Far West regions spent considerably more on a per student basis than did institutions in other regions. In fact, expenditures in those three regions almost one and one-half times greater than the national average of **$38.71**. Four year public schools spents slightly more than did two year private schools.

Institutions spent an average of **44.13%** of their non-print media budget on personnel; about **16%** on commodities, or expendable supplies; and about **13%** on equipment. These averages remained fairly constant, whether or not the operations included such services as broadcast television or radio.

Over **40%** of the institutions charged back some production costs to users, even those in academic departmens. In contrast, only **26%** of the respondents indicated that they charged some maintenance costs back to academic users. Athletic departments were most often charged for all costs related to materials production or equipment maintenance.

The institutions reported an average of **1.5** administrators for media units, with over 60% of the institutions reporting at least one administrator on the staff. In contrast, only **21%** of the institutions had anyone listed as distribution staff, only **31%** had anyone listed as maintenance staff, only **21%** had anyone listed as production staff, and only **37%** had anyone listed as clerical staff. The average was 1.3 persons per unit. While 10% had at least two student helpers, the average was an overwhelming **9.3** students who worked in media units, probably because full time staff was not available.

About **20%** of the respondents indicated that they had <u>added</u> a staff position to their operation, while only **10%** reported that they had <u>lost</u> a position during the past year. About two and one-half positions were added for each position lost.

Over **87%** of the respondents indicated that they had access to a computer. Of these, over **77%** had access to a <u>micro-computer or a combination micro-computer and mainframe</u>. The most common micro-computer brand was an **IBM**, with an **Apple IIe** listed second.

Distribution

An overwhelming majority of responding institutions maintained libraries of films, film-strips, audio tapes, recordings, video tapes, slides, and overhead transparency materials. Well over 80% indicated that they maintained an equipment pool for faculty use, and over 75% would deliver equipment to classrooms upon request.

Over 40% of the schools indicated that they provided video cable distribution to an average of 100 classrooms on their campus, with about 20% of those rooms having color monitors. Over 18% reported that the cable system included satellite reception and about 4% reported that they could originate satellite broadcasts.

Maintenance

Sixty percent of the schools provide their own, in house, maintenance of at least the traditional media hardware. In addition, over one-third of the schools also provided for maintenance of video cameras, which normally require the services of a highly trained technician.

Over 54% of the respondents indicated that they did not carry a parts inventory. If they did, the average parts inventory was valued at over $6,200. A majority of the respondents reported that maintenance or repair services had increased when compared to the prior year.

Video Production

About 75% of the respondents indicated that they were engaged in the production of video materials for campus users, with a large majority reporting that their production time had increased over the prior year. Much of the production involved the recording of events on or around campus, with half of those productions being done in a studio and half being done as single camera remotes. Two-year schools averaged more studio productions than remotes.

Operations which included post-production, or editing, estimated that they spent about 60% of the time engaged in actual production and about 40% of the time engaged in post-production activities.

These figures support previous studies which indicated that the trend in video production is away from complicated, scripted studio productions, and now tends to include the recording of campus events which do not involve a great deal of advanced planning or scripting. Respondents indicated that much of their activity involves remote productions, which, in turn, requires more post-production work.

The bulk of video production is being done for academic users, although promotional materials, for student affairs and public relations, represent a significant work load. Two-year schools devote slightly more production time to athletic and public relations work than do four-year schools.

When asked to identify brands of cameras used, respondents reported that Sony cameras were used most often in studio operations and Panasonic cameras were used most often for remote productions. The average studio had three cameras, was about 735 square feet in size and, in addition to production work, was also used for classroom instruction about six hours per week. Studios were most often equipped with special effects and title generators, and about one-third of the respondents indicated that they also had chroma-key and film chains available for production work.

The largest percentage of remote productions were done on 3/4" video cassettes, but almost half of the schools are also using VHS format tapes for original production and editing operations. Following production, tapes were distributed on VHS format more than half the time. Post-production operations used title generators more than half of the time, but such sophisticated aides as special effects generators and chroma-key inserts were not as available to post-production operators as they were to studio operators.

Other Production Services

Only twelve institutions reported any motion picture production activity, with the majority of that production being done for public relations offices. It may be no coincidence that the greatest users of motion picture production services are related to promoting the institution to the general public, given the wide availability of film equipment for playback. It is evident, however, that as end users obtain more compatible equipment, especially in the VHS video format, the distribution of promotional material on film will be even further reduced.

Sixty-four percent of the institutions reported that they also provided some type of 35mm film production service to campus, although the majority of such production was provided mainly by larger institutions. Almost the same percentage of institutions (64%) provide some sort of walk-in production facility for faculty to use for the production of slides or transparencies. This type of production facility is most common in those institutions in which learning resource centers are a part of the media services unit.

General

Non-print media operations are available to most faculty in most colleges in the nation. Although smaller schools do not have the budget or the staff to provide extensive distribution or production services, a generalized conclusion could be made that any faculty member, no matter where he or she teaches, has available some classroom support from an agency which is, in turn, supported by a predominantly academic-focused operation. If access to non-print media support was the only determining factor in selection of an area of the country in which to teach, faculty members should most often choose the West Coast or the Great Plaines regions, since those areas spend the most money on services of this type.

One would assume that, as schools get larger, they would tend to spend more money per student on media services, but this study reveals that there is a slight advantage in those schools with average enrollments of about 7,500 or 25,000 students. Both of these size categories spend more money on media services, on a per-student basis, than the national average. Faculty would, however, find no advantage in choosing a four-year school over a two-year school, or a public school over a private school, since there is no significant difference in media spending in either of these categories.

Almost all of the indicators of growth, such as increase in staff, increases in maintenance or production activities, are evident in a majority of the schools surveyed. Again, a conclusion could be made that media services are being used and are being used more often this year than they were last year. Growth is seen as a result of supplying the user with meaningful service, and increases in such service implies that media units are providing services to users who appreciate the effort and want to return for more.

The original purpose of this study was to determine if faculty members in post-secondary institutions had access to a variety of non-print media services and to determine the extent of use of such services. Although it may be difficult to generalize from a sample of just over ten percent of the population, results of this study indicate that they majority of college and university media centers do provide media services to their faculty and that faculty members are the largest users of those services.

A possible topic for further research would be an analysis of the perceptions of the faculty toward such services in an effort to determine whether or not a majority of the faculty in a given institution is aware of the availability of such support and to determine whether or not such support is of value in their teaching.

Although colleges and universities do not support instruction with the same degree of sophistication as do business and industry, especially in highly skilled technical training, the reason could be that the faculty do not expect or require such support, even if they are aware of its existance. A study of faculty attitudes might prove enlightening and might even provide suggestions for adding to or improving services now in existance.

REFERENCES

"Media Leaders Predict Five-Year Growth Rate of New Technologies." TechTrends, November/December, 1985, pg. 10.

McConeghy, G. L. "The State Of TV Production in Higher Education." TechTrends, November/December, 1985, pp. 19-21.

McConeghy, J. I. Learning Experiences and Achievement of 17-year-old High School Students as Assessed by the National Assessment of Educational Progress: 1975-1982 (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1985).

Riccobono, John A. Instructional Technology in Higher Education. Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C., 1986. (Available from Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Washington, D.C.)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

List of Responding Institutions
(Listed by Size and Region)

UNIV OF MAINE AT PRESQUE ISLE
PRESQUE ISLE, ME 04769

COLBY COLLEGE
WATERVILLE, ME 04901

EMMANUEL COLLEGE
BOSTON, MA 02115

DANIEL WEBSTER COLLEGE
NASHUA, NH 03063

CHAMPLAIN COLLEGE
BURLINGTON, VT 05401

CUMBERLAND COUNTY COLLEGE
VINELAND, NJ 08360

PENNSYLVANIA ST UNIV - MCKEESPORT
MCKEESPORT, PA 15132

UNIV OF PITTSBURG - GREENSBURG
GREENSBURG, PA 15601

GALLAUDET COLLEGE
WASHINGTON, DC 20002

COLLEGE OF MOUNT ST. VINCENT
RIVERDALE, NY 10471

THE JUILLIARD SCHOOL
NEW YORK, NY 10023

SKIDMORE COLLEGE
SARATOGA SPRINGS, NY 12866

LEBANON VALLEY COLLEGE
ANNVILLE, PA 17003

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE
SWARTHMORE, PA 19081

ACADEMY OF AERONAUTICS
FLUSHING, NY 11371

PEIRCE JUNIOR COLLEGE
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19102

CULINARY INSTITUTE OF AMERICA
HYDE PARK, NY 12538

JUNIOR COLLEGE OF ALBANY
ALBANY, NY 12208

SPOON RIVER COLLEGE
CANTON, IL 61520

ALPENA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ALPENA, MI 49707

MONROE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
MONROE, MI 48161

KIRTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ROSCOMMON, MI 48653

SHAWNEE COLLEGE
ULLIN, IL 62992

LIMA TECHNICAL COLLEGE
LIMA, OH 45804

KENT STATE UNIV - STARK CNTY CAMPUS
CANTON, OH 44720

ILLINOIS WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
BLOOMINGTON, IL 61701

ROSARY COLLEGE
RIVER FOREST, IL 60305

ANDERSON COLLEGE
ANDERSON, IN 46012

ADRIAN COLLEGE
ADRIAN, MI 49221

GRAND RAPIDS BAPTIST COLLEGE
GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49505

DENISON UNIVERSITY
GRANVILLE, OH 43023

KENYON COLLEGE
GAMBIER, OH 43022

APPENDIX A, Continued

ALVERNO COLLEGE
MILWAUKEE, WI 53215

CARTHAGE COLLEGE
KENOSHA, WI 53141

MOUNT VERNON NAZARENE COLLEGE
MOUNT VERNON, OH 43050

WAYNE STATE COLLEGE
WAYNE, NE 68787

BUTLER COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
EL DORADO, KS 67042

DODGE CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
DODGE CITY, KS 67801

SEWARD COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
LIBERAL, KS 67901

COE COLLEGE
CEDAR RAPIDS, IA 52402

MORNINGSIDE COLLEGE
SIOUX CITY, IA 51106

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS COLLEGE
ST PETER, MN 56082

ST. MARYS COLLEGE
WINONA, MN 55987

SCHOOL OF THE OZARKS
POINT LOOKOUT, MO 65726

CONCORDIA COLLEGE
SEWARD, NE 68434

MID-AMERICA NAZARENE COLLEGE
OLATHE, KS 66061

LIVINGSTON UNIVERSITY
LIVINGSTON, AL 35470

NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE
DAHLONEGA, GA 30533

FRANCIS MARION COLLEGE
FLORENCE, SC 29501

FLORIDA KEYS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
KEY WEST, FL 33040

ABRAHAM BALDWIN AGRI COLLEGE
TIFTON, GA 31793

MISSISSIPPI DELTA JR COLLEGE
MOORHEAD, MS 38761

LENOIR COMMUNITY COLLEGE
KINSTON, NC 28501

COLUMBIA STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
COLUMBIA, TN 38401

SUMTER AREA TECHNICAL COLLEGE
SUMTER, SC 29150

WILSON COUNTY TECHNICAL INSTITUTE
WILSON, NC 27893

RICHMOND TECHNICAL COLLEGE
HAMLET, NC 28345

DYERSBURG STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
DYERSBURG, TN 38024

BEAUFORT COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
WASHINGTON, NC 27889

SOUTHSIDE VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ALBERTA, VA 23821

GARLAND COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
HOT SPRINGS, AR 71913

TRI-CITIES STATE TECH INSTITUTE
BLOUNTVILLE, TN 37617

ELIZABETH CITY STATE UNIVERSITY
ELIZABETH CITY, NC 27909

UNIVERSITY OF TAMPA
TAMPA, FL 33606

CENTENARY COLLEGE OF LOUISIANA
SHREVEPORT, LA 71104

XAVIER UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA
NEW ORLEANS, LA 70125

APPENDIX A, Continued

MARS HILL COLLEGE
MARS HILL, NC 28787

CARSON-NEWMAN COLLEGE
JEFFERSON CITY, TN 37760

SOUTHWESTERN AT MEMPHIS
MEMPHIS, TN 38112

WEST VIRGINIA WESLEYAN COLLEGE
BUCKHANNON, WV 26201

CHOWAN COLLEGE
MURFREESBORO, NC 27855

SULLIVAN JUNIOR COLLEGE
LOUISVILLE, KY 40205

WATTERSON COLLEGE
LOUISVILLE, KY 40218

SUL ROSS STATE UNIVERSITY
ALPINE, TX 79832

WHARTON COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE
WHARTON, TX 77488

SOUTHERN NAZARENE COLLEGE
BETHANY, OK 73008

UNIVERSITY OF MARY HARDIN-BAYLOR
BELTON, TX 76513

ST. EDWARDS UNIVERSITY
AUSTIN, TX 78704

WAYLAND BAPTIST UNIVERSITY
PLAINVIEW, TX 79072

COLORADO NORTHWESTERN COMM COLL
RANGELY, CO 81648

MILES COMMUNITY COLLEGE
MILES CITY, MT 59301

COLLEGE OF GREAT FALLS
GREAT FALLS, MT 59405

TAFT COLLEGE
TAFT, CA 93268

TREASURE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ONTARIO, OR 97914

CALIFORNIA COLL OF ARTS AND CRAFTS
OAKLAND, CA 94618

COLLEGE OF NOTRE DAME
BELMONT, CA 94002

REED COLLEGE
PORTLAND, OR 97202

FASHION INSTITUTE OF DESIGN
LOS ANGELES, CA 90017

KEENE STATE COLLEGE
KEENE, NH 03431

CAPE COD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
WEST BARNSTABLE, MA 02668

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE AT AUGUSTA
AUGUSTA, ME 04330

MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
BALTIMORE, MD 21239

EAST STROUDSBURG UNIVERSITY
EAST STROUDSBURG, PA 18301

RAMAPO COLLEGE
MAHWAH, NJ 07430

FREDERICK COMMUNITY COLLEGE
FREDERICK, MD 21701

ALFRED AGRI & TECH COLLEGE - SUNY
ALFRED, NY 14802

LUZERNE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
NANTICOKE, PA 18634

PENN ST UNIV - OGONTZ CAMPUS
ABINGTON, PA 19001

ST. BONAVENTURE UNIVERSITY
ST. BONVENTURE, NY 14778

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY
LEWISBURG, PA 17837

PHILADELPHIA COLL OF TEXTILES & SC
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19144

YORK COLLEGE OF PENNSYLVANIA
YORK, PA 17405

MORTON COLLEGE
CICERO, IL 60650

CLARK TECHNICAL COLLEGE
SPRINGFIELD, OH 45505

MICHAEL J. OWENS TECHNICAL COLLEGE
TOLEDO, OH 43699

KISHWAUKEE COLLEGE
MALTA, IL 60150

OLIVE HARVEY COLLEGE
CHICAGO, IL 60628

RICHLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
DECATUR, IL 62526

CHICAGO CITY-WIDE COLLEGE
CHICAGO, IL 60601

INDIANA UNIVERSITY AT KOKOMO
KOKOMO, IN 46902

ELMHURST COLLEGE
ELMHURST, IL 60126

UNIVERSITY OF EVANSVILLE
EVANSVILLE, IN 47702

AQUINAS COLLEGE
GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49506

ASHLAND COLLEGE
ASHLAND, OH 44805

NORTHERN STATE COLLEGE
ABERDEEN, SD 57401

LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
WHITE BEAR LAKE, MN 55110

DRURY COLLEGE
SPRINGFIELD, MO 65802

AUGUSTA COLLEGE
AUGUSTA, GA 30910

TALLAHASSEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
TALLAHASSEE, FL 32304

PITT COMMUNITY COLLEGE
GREENVILLE, NC 27834

CENTRAL VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
LYNCHBURG, VA 24502

SHELTON STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
TUSCALOOSA, AL 35404

PIEDMONT VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA 22901

STATE TECH INST AT KNOXVILLE
KNOXVILLE, TN 37919

NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY
DURHAM, NC 27707

MERCER UNIVERSITY
MACON, GA 31207

ELON COLLEGE
ELON COLLEGE, NC 27244

CAMERON UNIVERSITY
LAWTON, OK 73505

EAST. NEW MEXICO UNIV. AT CLOVIS
CLOVIS, NM 88101

TRINITY VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ATHENS, TX 75751

EASTERN ARIZONA COLLEGE
THATCHER, AZ 85552

NORTH LAKE COLLEGE
IRVING, TX 75062

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES
GOLDEN, CO 80401

AIMS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
GREELEY, CO 80632

REGIS COLLEGE
DENVER, CO 80221

BLUE MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PENDLETON, OR 97801

YAKIMA VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
YAKIMA, WA 98902

SEATTLE PACIFIC UNIVERSITY
SEATTLE, WA 98119

WESTERN CONNECTICUT STATE COLLEGE
DANBURY, CT 06810

SALEM STATE COLLEGE
SALEM, MA 01970

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MAINE
PORTLAND, ME 04103

SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY
BOSTON, MA 02108

JERSEY CITY STATE COLLEGE
JERSEY CITY, NJ 07305

SUNY - COLLEGE AT ONEONTA
ONEONTA, NY 13820

SHIPPENSBURG UNIVERSITY
SHIPPENSBURG, PA 17257

OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE
TOMS RIVER, NJ 08753

BROOME COMMUNITY COLLEGE
BINGHAMTON, NY 13902

MOHAWK VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
UTICA, NY 13501

WESTCHESTER COMMUNITY COLLEGE
VALHALLA, NY 10595

MONTGOMERY CTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
BLUE BELL, PA 19422

UNIV OF MARYLAND - BALTIMORE COUNTY
CATONSVILLE, MD 21228

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON, DC 20064

UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER
ROCHESTER, NY 14627

GRAND VALLEY STATE COLLEGES
ALLENDALE, MI 49401

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - LA CROSSE
LA CROSSE, WI 54601

ELGIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ELGIN, IL 60120

JACKSON COMMUNITY COLLEGE
JACKSON, MI 49201

LAKELAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
MENTOR, OH 44060

LINCOLN LAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
SPRINGFIELD, IL 62708

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME
NOTRE DAME, IN 46556

ST. LOUIS COMM COLL AT FOREST PARK
ST. LOUIS, MO 63110

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI - ROLLA
ROLLA, MO 65401

COLLEGE OF ST. THOMAS
ST. PAUL, MN 55105

WEST GEORGIA COLLEGE
CARROLLTON, GA 30118

MCNEESE STATE UNIVERSITY
LAKE CHARLES, LA 70605

JOHN C. CALHOUN ST COMM COLLEGE
DECATUR, AL 35602

SANTA FE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
GAINESVILLE, FL 32601

GREENVILLE TECHNICAL COLLEGE
GREENVILLE, SC 29606

APPENDIX A, Continued

STATE TECH INST AT MEMPHIS
MEMPHIS, TN 38134

WESTERN CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
CULLOWHEE, NC 28723

EASTERN NEW MEXICO UNIVERSITY
PORTALES, NM 88130

SAINT PHILIPS COLLEGE
SAN ANTONIO, TX 78203

OSCAR ROSE JUNIOR COLLEGE
MIDWEST CITY, OK 73110

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA
MISSOULA, MT 59812

ARAPAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
LITTLETON, CO 80120

RICKS COLLEGE
REXBURG, ID 83440

SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
ROHNERT PARK, CA 94928

NAPA COLLEGE
NAPA, CA 94558

LANE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
EUGENE, OR 97405

GREEN RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE
AUBURN, WA 98002

SKAGIT VALLEY COLLEGE
MOUNT VERNON, WA 98273

EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE
SAN JOSE, CA 95135

UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA - SANTA CRUZ
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95064

LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY
LOMA LINDA, CA 92350

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT
BURLINGTON, VT 05405

SUNY - ALBANY
ALBANY, NY 12222

WILLIAM PATERSON COLLEGE
WAYNE, NJ 07470

MIDDLESEX COUNTY COLLEGE
EDISON, NJ 08818

COUNTY COLLEGE OF MORRIS
RANDOLPH, NJ 07869

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
KENT, OH 44242

INDIANA U./PURDUE U. AT FORT WAYNE
FORT WAYNE, IN 46805

UNIV OF WISCONSIN - WHITEWATER
WHITEWATER, WI 53190

JOLIET JUNIOR COLLEGE
JOLIET, IL 60436

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
MANHATTAN, KS 66506

MANKATO STATE UNIVERSITY
MANKATO, MN 56001

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA 22903

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
BOWLING GREEN, KY 42101

CENTRAL PIEDMONT COMMUNITY COLLEGE
CHARLOTTE, NC 28235

HILLSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE
TAMPA, FL 33622

UNIV OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHARLOTTE
CHARLOTTE, NC 28223

PHOENIX COLLEGE
PHOENIX, AZ 85013

TULSA JUNIOR COLLEGE
TULSA, OK 74119

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
CORVALLIS, OR 97331

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIV - FRESNO
FRESNO, CA 93740

COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO
SAN MATEO, CA 94402

SANTA ROSA JUNIOR COLLEGE
SANTA ROSA, CA 95401

SAN DIEGO CITY COLLEGE
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA - IRVINE
IRVINE, CA 92717

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
PITTSBURGH, PA 15260

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, DC 20052

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
DEKALB, IL 60115

TRITON COLLEGE
RIVER GROVE, IL 60171

LOUISIANA STATE UNIV AND A&M COLLEGE
BATON ROUGE, LA 70803

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY
ATLANTA, GA 30303

NORTHERN VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ANNANDALE, VA 22003

TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE
FORT WORTH, TX 76102

UNIV OF CALIFORNIA - BERKELEY
BERKELEY, CA 94720

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIV - LONG BEACH
LONG BEACH, CA 90840

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIV - NORTHRIDGE
NORTHRIDGE, CA 91330

SANTA MONICA COLLEGE
SANTA MONICA, CA 90405

APPENDIX B

List of States in HEGIS Regions

OBE Regional States
(HEGIS Table 6)

Region *	OBE Name	States Included
1	New England	CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT
2	Mid East	DE, DC, MD, NJ, NY, PA
3	Great Lakes	IL, IN, MI, OH, WI
4	Plaines	IA, KS, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD
5	South East	AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, WV
6	South West	AZ, NM, OK, TX
7	Rocky Mountains	CO, ID, MT, UT, WY
8 **	Far West	CA, NV, OR, WA

* U. S. Service Schools and Outlying Areas were not included.
** Alaska and Hawaii were not included.

APPENDIX C

Questionnaire

SURVEY OF HIGHER EDUCATION NON-PRINT MEDIA SUPPORT

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data from a selected sample of national institutions as a means of evaluating media services in the 1980s. The questionnaire should take very little time to complete. If you have comments, please write them on the back of the sheet containing the relevant question.

The questionnaire is divided into five sections. Complete those sections which apply directly to your operation. If some other unit on campus provides video services, for example, feel free to copy this questionnaire and ask that unit to complete it, but include in your reply only those items which pertain directly to your operation.

Address information will be used for demographic purposes. Each respondent will receive a copy of the completed report. We appreciate your assistance in this project.

Name of person responding: _____

Title: _____

Institution: _____

Address: _____

_____

Estimate your Fall, 1985, **headcount** enrollment: _____

To whom does the Media Services Director report?

(President, Vice-President, etc.) _____

Does your service:

include broadcast video operations? Yes ___ No ___
include broadcast radio operations? Yes ___ No ___
include campus cable video services? Yes ___ No ___
include a regional or cooperative film library? Yes ___ No ___
include library or learning center operations? Yes ___ No ___

ADMINISTRATION:

1. What is your total media operating budget? $ _____

2. What percentage is devoted to personnel? _____ %

3. What percentage is devoted to commodities purchases? _____ %

4. What percentage is devoted to equipment purchases? _____ %

5. Do you charge back any production or maintenance costs to:

	All costs	Some charge	No charge
Academic department productions	_____	_____	_____
Administrative unit productions	_____	_____	_____
Athletic unit productions	_____	_____	_____
Public relations productions	_____	_____	_____
Academic department maintenance	_____	_____	_____
Administrative unit maintenance	_____	_____	_____
Athletic unit maintenance	_____	_____	_____

6. Estimate the percentage of time devoted to each of the following for your total operation last year. (Total to 100%)

Academic Affairs	_____ %
Business Affairs	_____ %
General Campus Administration	_____ %
Student Affairs	_____ %
Athletics	_____ %
Public Relations	_____ %
Individual Faculty Users	_____ %

7. What is the size of your media staff? (include part time staff)

Administrative staff	# _____
Distribution staff	# _____
Maintenance staff	# _____
Production staff	# _____
Clerical staff	# _____
Student help	# _____

8. How many staff members did you add last year? added _____

9. How many did you eliminate last year? eliminated _____

10. Do you have access to computer facilities? Yes ___ No ___

11. Is it a: ____ mainframe computer?
____ micro or mini computer housed in your unit?
____ combination of mainframe and micro or mini?

12. If you have a micro computer, indicate brand name: _____

13. Do you use a computer to:

Write scripts for productions?	Yes ___	No ___
Prepare budget information?	Yes ___	No ___
Maintain personnel records?	Yes ___	No ___
Prepare catalog materials?	Yes ___	No ___
Maintain circulation records?	Yes ___	No ___
Keep track of inventory?	Yes ___	No ___
Keep track of repair parts?	Yes ___	No ___
Prepare routine office correspondence?	Yes ___	No ___

DISTRIBUTION

14. Do you maintain a film library for campus use? Yes ___ No ___

15. If yes, estimate the number of prints available. prints _____

16. Do you deliver films to campus faculty offices? Yes ___ No ___

17. Do you maintain a library of other materials for faculty use:

Filmstrips	Yes ___	No ___
Audio Tapes	Yes ___	No ___
Phono Disks	Yes ___	No ___
Video Tapes	Yes ___	No ___
Slides	Yes ___	No ___
Transparencies	Yes ___	No ___

18. Do you have an equipment pool for faculty use? Yes ___ No ___

19. Do you deliver equipment to classrooms? Yes ___ No ___

20. Is equipment permanently housed near classrooms? Yes ___ No ___

21. Do you rent equipment to off campus users? Yes ___ No ___

22. Do you have a campus video distribution system to your dormatories? Yes ___ No ___

23. Do you have a campus video distribution system to your academic buildings? Yes ___ No ___

24. Estimate the total number of rooms served by the distribution system. (both dorms and classrooms) rooms _____

25. What percentage of these rooms have color monitors? % _____

26. Do you use facilities (rented or owned) for:

video satellite reception?	Yes ___	No ___
video satellite origination?	Yes ___	No ___

MAINTENANCE SERVICES

27. Does your unit provide for equipment maintenance? Yes ___ No ___

28. If not, do you: ___ use an outside contractor...or
___ does another campus unit provide maintenance?

29. If you do provide maintenance, do you: (check any that apply)

___ Maintain studio video cameras?
___ Maintain field video cameras?
___ Maintain video tape recorders?
___ Maintain video editing systems?
___ Maintain video receivers or monitors?
___ Maintain classroom film projectors?
___ Maintain 35mm camera equipment?
___ Maintain general media equipment?
(slide proj., filmstrip proj., etc.)
___ Maintain campus audio equipment?

30. What is the approximate size of your repair shop? _____ s.f.

31. How many bench positions are housed in your repair shop? _____

32. What is the estimated cost of your parts inventory? $ _____

33. Compared to the prior year, did the total number of hours devoted to **MAINTENANCE**: stay same _____ increase _____ decrease _____

VIDEO PRODUCTION

34. How many non-broadcast video productions did you complete during the past fiscal year? productions _____

35. How many total hours of production work did your video service perform during the past fiscal year? hours _____

36. Compared to the prior year, did the total number of hours devoted to **VIDEO PRODUCTIONS**: stay same _____ increase _____ decrease _____

37. What percentage of your video production time is devoted to:

Scripted projects? % _____
Simple event recordings? % _____

38. What percentage of your video production time is devoted to:

Studio productions % _____
Remote productions % _____

39. What percentage of your video production time is devoted to:

Production in studio or field	% _____
Post production or editing	% _____

40. Estimate the percentage of time devoted to each of the following for production operations last year. (Total to 100%)

Academic Affairs	_____ %
Business Affairs	_____ %
General Campus Administration	_____ %
Student Affairs	_____ %
Athletics	_____ %
Public Relations	_____ %
Individual Faculty Users	_____ %

41. How many studio cameras are available for non-broadcast production work? number _____

42. What is the predominate brand? _____

43. What is the approximate size of your video studio? s.f. _____

44. Is your production studio also used for classroom instruction during the academic year? Yes ___ No ___

45. If your studio is used for instruction, estimate the number of hours per week it is used for that purpose. hrs _____

46. If your studio is used for instruction, do you provide engineering support for these classes? Yes ___ No ___

47. If the answer to question 46 is Yes, estimate the total number of hours of such support last year. hrs _____

48. During studio productions, can you:

Produce special effects? (wipes, etc.)	Yes ___	No ___
Use chroma-key effects?	Yes ___	No ___
Insert generated titles?	Yes ___	No ___
Insert slides or films with filmchain?	Yes ___	No ___

49. Do you have a:

Separate control room?	Yes ___	No ___
Separate film chain area?	Yes ___	No ___
Separate master control area?	Yes ___	No ___

50. How many field cameras are available for non-broadcast production work? number _____

51. What is the predominate brand? _____

52. If you do field production, do you:

Use a remote van with control equipment?	Yes ___	No ___
Produce materials film style (one camera)?	Yes ___	No ___

53. Do you:

Edit using 3/4" cassette format?	Yes ___	No ___
Edit using Beta format?	Yes ___	No ___
Edit using VHS format?	Yes ___	No ___
Edit using 1" format?	Yes ___	No ___
Edit using 2" format?	Yes ___	No ___
Edit using computer assisted equipment?	Yes ___	No ___
Distribute finished materials mainly on VHS?	Yes ___	No ___
Distribute mainly on Beta?	Yes ___	No ___
Distribute mainly on 3/4" cassettes?	Yes ___	No ___
Distribute any materials on video disk?	Yes ___	No ___

54. During post-production, can you:

Introduce special effects? (wipes, etc.)	Yes ___	No ___
Use chroma-key effects?	Yes ___	No ___
Insert generated titles?	Yes ___	No ___

OTHER PRODUCTION SERVICES

55. Do you provide motion picture production services for your campus? Yes ___ No ___

56. Estimate the percentage of time devoted to each of the following for <u>film production operations</u> last year. (Total to 100%)

Academic Affairs	_____ %
Business Affairs	_____ %
General Campus Administration	_____ %
Student Affairs	_____ %
Athletics	_____ %
Public Relations	_____ %
Individual Faculty Users	_____ %

57. Do you provide 35mm production services for your campus? Yes ___ No ___

58. Do you provide graphic or art work production for your campus? Yes ___ No ___

59. Estimate the percentage of time devoted to each of the following for 35mm or graphic production operations last year.

Academic Affairs	_____ %
Business Affairs	_____ %
General Campus Administration	_____ %
Student Affairs	_____ %
Athletics	_____ %
Public Relations	_____ %
Individual Faculty Users	_____ %

60. Do you provide a facility for use by faculty for production of 35mm materials or overhead transparencies? Yes ___ No ___